

*His Character, Court, and
Chroniclers 321*

porary Western literature is so clear and well unfolded."¹ Nilus declares that the Patriarchates of Antioch, Rome, and Alexandria, founded by Peter, are quite independent of one another. To these were added by the Councils of Nicaea, Constantinople, and Chalcedon (325,381,451 A.D.) Jerusalem and Constantinople. Rome indeed had the Primacy at first because the city was the capital of the Empire, but since then, fallen under barbarian masters, it had ceased to be an imperial city. Meanwhile, Constantinople, called "New Rome" at Chalcedon, remained equal to the old Rome, and had gained the Primacy since the Emperor now resided there. Sicily and Calabria, he continues, since Rome fell under barbarians, have been subject to Constantinople, and the Archbishop of Syracuse with twenty-one suffragans is subject to the eastern Patriarch. The Franks" *i.e.*, the Normans, had brought the Papacy with them; it should be Roger's work to undo this and subject to the Patriarch his former possessions.

The work of Nilus was a bold piece of pamphlet-eering, and the tone of it implies that the author was confident of the royal *imprimatur*. It is improbable that Roger would have subjected his

dominions in whole or part to the Greek Patriarch.

But he was tempted by the prospect of being as absolute temporally over his churches as the

¹ Caspar, *Die Grundung, op. oil,,* p. 460. Parthey, *Hieroclis synecdemus* , . . . *NUi Doxapatrii notitia Patriarchatum.* . . . , . . . Berlin, 1866.